

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended by the present response to correct minor informalities therein. The specification is also amended to no longer refer to "Patent Document 1", to address the objection noted in paragraph 3 in the Office Action. In that respect applicants note the specification has been amended to now consistently refer to JP-A-11-20387, which was already cited in the specification at page 2, lines 5-9.

Claims 12-19 are pending in this application. Original claims 1-11 are canceled by the present response without prejudice and new claims 12-19 are added herein. Applicants submit no new matter is added as the subject matter in new claims 12-19 is fully supported by the original specification, including the original claims.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. That rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of those claims. Further, new claims 12-19 have been written to avoid the language noted as unclear in original claims 6 and 7.

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0162118 to Levy et al. (herein "Levy"). Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Levy in view of U.S. patent 7,120,924 to Katcher et al. (herein "Katcher").

The above-noted rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

The present response presents new claims 12-19 for examination, of which new claims 12, 15, 18, and 19 are independent. New independent claim 12 incorporates features from original claims 4, 5, and 8. New independent claim 15 incorporates features from original claims 4, 5, and 9. New claim 18 is a corresponding method claim to new independent claim 12. New independent claim 19 is a corresponding method claim to new independent claim 15.

Applicants respectfully submit features recited in the claims as currently written distinguish over the previously applied art to Levy, and further in view of Katcher.

With respect to new independent claims 12, 15, 18, and 19, those claims are directed to a server device or method capable of accessing a hyper-media data client through a network. As recited in each of new independent claims 12, 15, 18, and 19 metadata includes:

object-area data specifying the area of an object  
appearing in the image corresponding to the time stamp; and

data specifying contents to be displayed when the area  
specified by the object-area data is designated, or an action to  
be performed when the area specified by the object-area data is  
designated[.]

Applicants respectfully submit such features clearly distinguish over the previously applied art to Levy and Katcher.

With respect to the above-noted features of the metadata the outstanding grounds for rejection cites Katcher at column 4, lines 34-48.<sup>1</sup> Applicants traverse that grounds for the outstanding rejection. Specifically, at column 4, lines 34-48 Katcher merely notes annotation data can be displayed desired on a screen along with an object. That disclosure in Katcher is not at all directed to metadata specifically including “data specifying contents to be displayed when the area specified by the object-area data is designated, or an action to be performed when the area specified by the object-area data is designated”. The mere displaying of annotation data in a designated area does not disclose or suggest that metadata specifies contents to be displayed or an action to be performed. Further, the mere disclosure of an annotation in Katcher also does not indicate that the metadata “specifies the area of an object appearing in the image corresponding to the time stamp”, as also recited in new independent claims 12, 15, 18, and 19.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of August 27, 2007, page 8, first paragraph.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit new independent claims 12, 15, 18, and 19 distinguish over Levy in view of Katcher.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit new independent claims 12 and 18 recite additional features that distinguish over the applied art. New independent claim 12 further recites the server device includes:

a position-correspondence table storage unit to store a position-correspondence table in which the time stamp and the storage position of metadata related to the time stamp are in correspondence with each other[.]

New independent claim 18 recites a similar feature.

Applicants respectfully submit neither Levy nor Katcher disclose or suggest such a feature. In that respect Katcher does not teach any even similar table. Further, Levy discloses a Table 4 at the bottom of page 9 that stores content data and the position of the corresponding time stamp. However, independent claims 12 and 18, in contrast to Levy, recite a metadata storage and a table that shows a correspondence between a time stamp and a position of a storage of the corresponding metadata. Such a storage enables a rapid streaming distribution of metadata. The Table 4 in Levy does not provide such a storage.

Thereby, applicants respectfully submit new independent claims 12 and 18 even further distinguish over the applied art.

New independent claims 15 and 19 also recite additional features that are believed to even further distinguish over the applied art. In that respect new independent claim 15 recites the server further including:

a first-table storage unit to store a first table that brings sections of the time stamps related to a plurality of pieces of the metadata into correspondence with information for specifying the metadata; and

a second-table storage unit to store a second table that brings the time stamps into correspondence with storage positions of metadata related to the time stamps[.]

Independent claim 19 recites similar features.

Thereby, in new independent claims 15 and 19 a first table stores sections of time stamps related to a plurality of pieces of metadata and information for specifying the corresponding metadata, and a second table stores time stamps in positions of storage of the corresponding metadata. As a result, each time stamp makes it possible to call up a plurality of pieces of metadata quickly for streaming distribution.

Applicants respectfully submit neither Katcher nor Levy disclose or suggest any such tables. Levy shows a dispersion type router interactive system in Figure 4 that enables the storage of metadata in a plurality of positions. However, Levy does not disclose or suggest specifics of a first table storage unit for storing a plurality of pieces of metadata available for each time stamp and calling them up at a time, and specifics of the claimed second-table storage unit.


Thereby, applicants respectfully submit new independent claims 15 and 19 recite additional features that distinguish over Levy, and further in view of Katcher.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit new claims 12-19 as currently written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Registration No. 28,870  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
I:\ATTY\NSN\243083US-AM.DOC